11 May 1976

STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM [   ]
Chief, Review Staff, OP

SUBJECT: Analysis of IG Report

1.   Incorrect statements within the pages given to OP/RS for review:

a.   Page B-20: With reference to the Review Staff, "This Staff, consisting of a supervisor and three analysts, . . ." The Review Staff has a supervisor and two analysts.

b.   Page 20-B: Continuing the quote cited above, "analysts, has other functions, but clearly considers its support for APP to be most important." Approximately fifty percent of one analyst's time is devoted to APP and PDP. Equally important is the time spent by the Staff in regulatory review and publication, staff research for D/Pers, monitoring and doing impact studies on proposed federal laws that affect Agency personnel, briefing various training courses, serving as the responsible office within OP for MBO and the Program Call, sitting on Agency committees for such things as travel policy and restoration of annual leave, etc, etc.

c.   Page B-21: The IG report states, " . . ., belated modifications of instructions and failures to provide adequate briefing to the middle and lower-level line managers who must fill in the forms." In advance of sending out the final FY 76 APP formats all Admin and Pers Officers (those who actually fill out the report) were invited to GA-13

where three hours were alloted to discuss, go over and be educated on
the APP. At that meeting all attendees were advised that members of
the OP Review Staff would be most happy and anxious to meet with Career
Service or Subgroup personnel alone to further explain the philosophy
and techniques of the APP. Due to some complaints of directions being
insufficient the year before,the instructions for the FY 76 APP were
spelled out in greater detail than in prior years. The opportunity for
adequate briefing or communication was as available as could be
accomplished short of Career Heads directing their managers to attend

    d. Page H-4: The IG Report states,"Developmental profiles are
to be drafted by each major component of the Agency . . ." This
statement should be corrected to say developmental profiles <u>have been</u>
<u>drafted.</u>

we feel need clarification. On Page B-20 the Report states the OP/Review
Staff has "other functions, but clearly considers its support for APP to
be most important." While support of the APP and PDP are a vital part of
the Review Staffs functions, their support is no more important than the
review and update of Personnel Regulations, Handbooks, Notices, etc.
Another equally important function is the review of new legislation and
Executive Orders to ascertain their impact on Agency personnel policies
and procedures. The Review Staff is the focal point for staff guidance
to Agency OP managers on the OP MBO program, for the reports on OP
objectives, and for the preparation of the Program Call. This Staff also

prepares many Agency position papers in response to OMB and CSC requests. In sum the statement that the Review Staff "clearly considers its support for APP to be most important" is somewhat less than accurate.

3. On Page B-22 the Report states, "We found the detailed analysis done on the current APP for the Director unnecessarily prolix and complicated" is at the minimum subject to question. That analysis consisted of 10 pages and discussed specific points of personnel management concern; concerns which represent 49% of the Agency budget. At no time did the DCI, who had requested a detailed analysis, comment nor indicate he thought it was "unnecessarily prolix and complicated." This type of statement is indicative of what we feel to be a too prevalent opinion in the Agency -- that opinion being that personnel management deserves only a minimum of Management's attention.

4. In that same paragraph the Report states, "Moreover, we preceive a view of line management, in our discussions with Chief, Review Staff, that is not conducive to solving the communication problem -- namely, her view that line managers are unnecessarily sloppy, lack logic, and exhibit general indifference, all of which works against the program's success." Apparently the investigator misunderstood the Chief, Review Staff comments. The ones referred to as being unnecessarily sloppy, etc. are those who actually put the APP together. In very few cases, if ever, is that person a line manager. A review of the APP's as submitted would confirm the opinion of Chief, Review Staff.

5. The Report expressed concern for the line manager being unduly involved in complicated and detailed OP oriented projects that he or

3

she could not identify as being relevant to their situation. This would indeed be a concern if that were intended to be a part of APP. The APP, however, is not designed to function that way. At best the line manager will have physical input to only one-third of the report, granted that input should be based on analysis of the other two thirds, but the statistical work for that analysis should already have been done. In fact much if not all of the analysis should have been done. It is even probable that "line managers," managers below the Office and Division Head level, will have no input to the APP at all. The input should be done by the senior personnel and administrative officer with the close direction, complete knowledge and approval of the Office of Division Head at those levels and the Deputy Directors knowledge and approval at that level.

2 6. The goals and directions set forth in the APP are Office and Division goals and directions and are approved or amended as they support or conflict with Career Service goals and directions. The APP is not intended to be a working document that would help the line manager solve his daily working problems. It is not designed to solve any day by day problems except as they relate to the broad picture of personnel management. The APP is a yearly planning paper which, if followed, assures adequate and properly distributed headroom for promotions; a well-planned mix of clerical, technical and professional employees; continued and proper use of rotational assignments; a minimum number of PRAs; adequate training, etc.

4

_2,3_ Granted there are communication problems associated with the APP, however, we feel the most serious problems are not between line managers and the Office of Personnel. The lines of communication that need strengthening are as follows:

OP with DDs.

OP with Subgroup and Division Heads.

OP with senior Personnel Officers in Subgroups, Divisions and Career Services.

DDs with Subgroup and Division Heads.

DDs with Career Service Chiefs of Personnel and Admin Officers.

Subgroup and Division Heads with their senior Personnel and Admin Officers.

Subgroup and Division Heads with the line managers.

_3.4_. The IG Report is obviously correct in stating that the APP and to a lesser degree the PDP have not been fully accepted in the Agency. In discussing these topics with Agency personnel members of the Review Staff find three major causes for the complaints:

a. Misunderstanding the report by thinking it is only for the purposes of the Office of Personnel.

b. Understanding the intent and purposes of the report but failing to get Office and Career Service input or interest in the reports.

c. Receiving no feedback below the Deputy Director level regarding submissions.

The reports do create many aggrevations among those who prepare them. The aggrevations vary from office to office but one central theme is the

5

complexity of the APP. We agree with the IG investigators that the APP is not as complicated as many make it out to be. We have found that many of the problems are caused directly by failure to relate data on one page to the substance of another and failure to copy numbers correctly.

~9.5 We fully agree that continued communication on the purpose of the APP and PDP is needed - with the hope that the repetitive approach will bring about the second step which makes communication - the party of the second part listens and comprehends and acts. As an example, the guidances for the APP every year have suggested that the Career Service analyze their own APPs for purposes of Subgroup comprehension and feedback. In fact, the Review Staff has prepared Subgroup comparative charts for the Directorates. To our knowledge nothing was ever done with the material (except in the DDI in FY 76) even insofar as we could ascertain, to the Deputy Director not sending the Agency report to his own senior personnel managers.

10.6. It is pertinent to this reply to the IG investigators, but the APP analysis on an Agency basis had lead to a number of personnel management improvements, or attempts to improve, unfortunately what attribution to APP data - perhaps another lack of communication in that the action officers don't relate two activities or facts.